arXiv:1610.00353v2 [cs.DS] 4 Oct 2016

A Small-Order-Polynomial-Sized Linear Program for Solving the Traveling Salesman Problem

Moustapha Diaby
OPIM Department; University of Connecticut; Storrs, CT 06268
moustapha.diaby@business.uconn.edu

Mark H. Karwan
Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering; SUNY at Buffalo; Amherst, NY 14260
mkarwan@buffalo.edu

Lei Sun
Praxair, Inc.; Tonawanda, NY 14150
leisun@buffalo.edu

Abstract. We present a polynomial-sized linear program (LP) for the n-city TSP drawing upon "complex flow" modeling ideas by the first two authors who used an $O(n^9) \times O(n^8)$ model*. Here we have only $O(n^5)$ variables and $O(n^4)$ constraints. We do not model explicit cycles of the cities, and our modeling does not involve the city-to-city variables-based, traditional TSP polytope referred to in the literature as "*The* TSP Polytope." Optimal TSP objective value and tours are achieved by solving our proposed LP. In the case of a unique optimum, the integral solution representing the optimal tour is obtained using any LP solver (solution algorithm). In the case of alternate optima, an LP solver (e.g., an interior-point solver) may stop with a fractional (interior-point) solution, which (we prove) is a convex combination of alternate optimal TSP tours. In such cases, one of the optimal tours can be trivially retrieved from the solution using a simple iterative elimination procedure we propose. We have solved over a million problems with up to 27 cities using the barrier methods of CPLEX, consistently obtaining all integer solutions. Since LP is polynomially solvable and we have a model which is of polynomial size in n, the paper is thus offering (although, incidentally) a proof of the equality of the computational complexity classes "P" and "NP". The non-applicability and numerical refutations of existing negative *extended formulations* results (such as Braun et. al. (2015)** and Fiorini et al. (2015)*** in particular) are briefly discussed in an appendix.

Keywords: Linear Programming; Combinatorial Optimization; Traveling Salesman Problem; TSP; Computational Complexity.

*: Advances in Combinatorial Optimization: Linear Programming Formulation of the Traveling Salesman and Other Hard Combinatorial Optimization Problems (World Scientific, January 2016).

**: Braun, G., S. Fiorini, S. Pokutta, and D. Steurer (2015). Approximation Limits of Linear Programs (Beyond Hierarchies). Mathematics of Operations Research 40:3, pp. 756-772..

***: Fiorini, S., S. Massar, S. Pokutta, H.R. Tiwary, and R. de Wolf (2015). Exponential Lower Bounds for Polytopes in Combinatorial Optimization. Journal of the ACM 62:2, Article No. 17.

1 Introduction

The traveling salesman problem (TSP), with its many variants, is one of the most widely studied problems in Operations Research. A good review of natural formulations which have been proposed for the more general (asymmetric) version is given in Öncan *et al.* (2009). These formulations all

use the 'traditional' city-to-city modeling variables plus additional variables which are introduced in order to enforce the subtour elimination constraints and to tighten the bounds of the corresponding linear programming (LP) relaxation.

Here we will introduce a new modeling approach based on the work of Diaby (2007) and Diaby and Karwan (2016a). Those authors developed a generalized framework for formulating hard combinatorial optimization problems (COPs) as polynomial-sized linear programs. The perspective they adopted was that many of the well-known hard combinatorial optimization problems (starting with the TSP) could be modeled as Assignment Problems (APs) with side/complicating-constraints (see Diaby (2010a, b, c)). Their overall idea for the TSP was to use a flow perspective over an AP-based graph with nodes representing (city, time-of-travel) pairs, and arcs representing travel legs. The novel feature in their modeling was to have variables representing doublets and triplets of travel legs, thereby "building" enough information into the modeling variables themselves that the enforcement of the "complicating constraints" could be done implicitly by simply setting appropriate variables to zero in the model. This led to an $O(n^9)$-variables, $O(n^8)$-constraints model.

Using a similar modeling philosophy in this self-contained paper, we propose a simplified model with $O(n^5)$ variables and $O(n^4)$ constraints. Where Diaby (2007) and Diaby and Karwan (2016a) used doublets and triplets of arcs, we employ only combinations comprising a node (a "dot") and an arc (a "dash") of the AP-based graph in defining our flow variables. That is, whereas Diaby (2007) and Diaby and Karwan (2016a) respectively used three "dashes," we accomplish the optimization task with a "dot" and a "dash" only. Unlike in Diaby (2007) and Diaby and Karwan (2016a), in the overall polytope of this new model, not all extreme points are integer. We show that a projection of the model onto the space of one of its classes of variables is integral. Hence, by expressing TSP tour costs in terms of the variables being projected to only, the proposed LP always finds an optimal TSP tour. Since LP is polynomially solvable (e.g. Bazaraa, M.S., J.J. Jarvis and H.D. Sherali (2010)), and we have a model which has polynomial size in n, we are thus offering a new proof of the equality of the computational complexity classes "P" and "NP" (see Garey, M.R. and D.S. Johnson (1979) for a treatise on computational complexity).

The plan of this paper is as follows. We discuss a path representation of TSP tours in section 2. Section 3 develops our LP model of the path representations using the "complex flow" variables which we introduce. Special characteristics of the model structure are discussed in section 4. Problem size and our computational experiments are discussed in section 5. Finally, conclusions are discussed in section 6, and the non-applicability of existing negative *extended formulations* (EF) results for the "standard" TSP polytope and our software implementation of the model in this paper (which will be made publicly available) are described in Appendices A and B, respectively.

2 Path representation of TSP tours

We will begin this section with statements of our basic assumptions and notation for the TSP parameters. Then, we will develop the path representation which serves as the foundation for the developments in the remainder of the paper.

Assumption 1 We assume without loss of generality (w.l.o.g.) that:

1. The number of cities is greater than 5;
2. The TSP graph is complete; (Arcs on which travel is not permitted can be handled in the optimization model by associating large ("Big-M") costs to them.)

3. City "0" has been designated as the starting and ending point of the travels.

Definition 2 We refer to the order in which a given city is visited after city 0 in a given TSP tour as the "time-of-travel" of that city in that TSP tour. In other words, if city i is the r^{th} city to be visited after city 0 in a given TSP tour, then we will say that the *time-of-travel* of city i in the given tour is r.

Notation 3 (General Notation)

1. n : Total number of cities (including the starting city);
2. $\forall i, j \in \Omega := \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$, $c_{i,j}$: Cost of travel from city i to j;
3. $m := n - 1$ (Number of cities to sequence);
4. $M := \{1, \ldots, m\} = \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ (Set of cities to sequence);
5. $S := \{1, \ldots, m\} = \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ (Index set for the *times-of-travel*);
6. $Ext(\cdot)$: Set of extreme points of $(\cdot)$.

Our overall approach consists of formulating the TSP as a generalized flow problem over the AP-based digraph illustrated in Figure 1. We refer to this graph as the "TSP Flow Graph (TSPFG)." The nodes of the TSPFG correspond to (city, *time-of-travel*) pairs. The arcs of the graph link nodes at consecutive *times-of-travel* and represent travel legs. The graph notation is formalized below.

Notation 4 (TSPFG formalisms)

1. $\forall r \in S$, $N_r := M = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ (Set of cities that *can be* visited at *time* r);
2. $\overline{N} := \{(i, r) : r \in S,\ i \in N_r\}$ (Set of nodes of the TSPFG. We will, henceforth, write (i, r) $((i, r) \in \overline{N})$ as $[i, r]$ in order to distinguish it from other doublets);
3. $\forall r \in S$, $\forall i \in N_r$,
$$F_r(i) := \begin{cases} \varnothing & \text{if } r = m \\ N_{r+1} \backslash \{i\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(Forward star of node $[i, r]$ of the TSPFG);
4. $\forall r \in S$, $\forall i \in N_r$,
$$B_r(i) := \begin{cases} \varnothing & \text{if } r = 1 \\ N_{r-1} \backslash \{i\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(Backward star of node $[i, r]$ of the TSPFG);
5. $\overline{A} : \{(i, r, j),\ r \in R,\ i \in N_r,\ j \in F_r(i)\}$ (Set of arcs of the TSPFG. We will, henceforth, write (i, r, j) $((i, r, j) \in \overline{A})$ as $[i, r, j]$ in order to distinguish it from other triplets);



Figure 1: Illustration of the TSP Flow Graph

6. $R := \{1, \ldots, m-1\} = \{1, \ldots, n-2\}$ (Set of *stages* of the TSPFG which have nodes with positive out-degrees).

Remark 5 It follows directly from the definitions in Notations 4.3-4.5 that: $\forall (i,j) \in M^2, \forall r \in R$, $[i,r,j] \in \overline{A} \Longrightarrow i \neq j$. That is, no arc in the TSPFG connects a city with itself between consecutive *times-of-travel*, as illustrated in Figure 2 below.

Definition 6 ("stages," "levels," "TSP paths")

1. We refer to the set of nodes of the TSPFG corresponding to a city as a "level" of the graph. (The set of *levels* is denoted M in Notation 3.4);

2. We refer to the nodes of the TSPFG corresponding to a given *time-of-travel* of the TSP as a "stage" of the graph. (The set of *stages* is denoted S in Notation 3.5);

3. We refer to a path of the TSPFG that includes exactly one node of each *level* of the graph as a "TSP path."

A *TSP path* is illustrated in Figure 2.

Theorem 7 There exists a one-to-one correspondence between *TSP paths* (of the TSPFG) and TSP tours.

Proof. Trivial, since each *level*, i, of the TSPFG can be visited only once, and the number of *levels* is equal to the number of *stages*. ■



TSP Tour	
Stage	City
--	0
1	5
2	2
3	4
4	1
5	6
6	3
--	0

Figure 2: Illustration of "*TSP paths*" of the TSPFG

3 Mathematical programming model of *TSP paths*

We will first state the LP model. Then, we will illustrate each its classes of variables and constraints and provide further intuition on the modeling approach. Finally, we will discuss the objective function.

3.1 Modeling Variables

Notation 8 (Modeling variables)

1. $\forall[i,r,j] \in \overline{A}$, we define a variable $y_{[i,r,j]}$. Variable $y_{[i,r,j]}$ may be interpreted as the amount of flow in the *TSP*FG that traverses arc $[i,r,j]$ in a given (feasible) solution to our LP model (to be stated);

2. $\forall[i,r] \in \overline{N},\ \forall[j,s,k] \in \overline{A}$, we define a variable $x_{[i,r][j,s,k]}$. Variable $x_{[i,r][j,s,k]}$ may be interpreted as the amount of flow in the *TSP*FG that traverses both, node $[i,r]$ and arc $[j,s,k]$ in a given (feasible) solution to our LP model (to be stated).

Hence, our modeling variables respectively are comprised of an arc (for the y-variables), and a combination of an arc and a node (a "dash" and a "dot") of the TSPFG, as illustrated in Figure 3 below.

3.2 Model Constraints

Our Linear Programming (LP) model of *TSP path*s consists of the five main classes of constraints described below. We will subsequently fully explain each of these and the objective function.



Figure 3: Illustration of the modeling variables

3.2.1 Statement of the constraints

- **Initial Flow**

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{m} \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \notin \{i,j\}}}^{m} x_{[i,1][j,2,k]} = 1. \tag{1}$$

- **Mass Balance/Generalized Kirchhoff Equations (GKEs)**

$$x_{[i,r][i,r,j]} - \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \notin \{i,j\}}}^{m} x_{[i,r][j,r+1,k]} = 0;$$

$$\forall i, j = 1, \ldots, m : i \neq j; \quad \forall r = 1, \ldots, m-2. \tag{2}$$

$$x_{[i,r][j,r-1,i]} - \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \notin \{i,j\}}}^{m} x_{[i,r][k,r-2,j]} = 0;$$

$$\forall i, j = 1, \ldots, m : i \neq j; \quad \forall r = 3, \ldots, m. \tag{3}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i}}^{m} x_{[i,r][k,r-1,i]} - \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i}}^{m} x_{[i,r][i,r,k]} = 0;$$

$$\forall i = 1, \ldots, m; \quad \forall r = 2, \ldots, m-1. \tag{4}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{k=1\\k\notin\{i,u\}}}^{m} x_{[i,r][k,p-1,u]} - \sum_{\substack{k=1\\k\notin\{i,u\}}}^{m} x_{[i,r][u,p,k]} = 0; \quad \forall i,u = 1,\ldots,m : i \neq u;$$

$$\forall r = 1,\ldots,m; \quad \forall p = 2,\ldots,m-1 : p \notin \{r-1, r, r+1\}. \tag{5}$$

- **Node-pair Reciprocities**

$$x_{[i,r][k,r+1,j]} - x_{[j,r+2][i,r,k]} = 0$$

$$\forall i,j,k = 1,\ldots,m : i \neq j \neq k; \quad \forall r = 1,\ldots,m-2. \tag{6}$$

$$\sum_{k=1:k\notin\{i,j\}}^{m} x_{[i,r][k,s-1,j]} - \sum_{k=1:k\notin\{i,j\}}^{m} x_{[j,s][i,r,k]} = 0$$

$$\forall i,j = 1,\ldots,m : i \neq j; \quad \forall r = 1,\ldots,m-2; \quad \forall s = r+3,\ldots,m. \tag{7}$$

- **Flow Consistencies**

$$y_{[i,r,j]} - x_{[i,r][i,r,j]} = 0;$$

$$\forall i,j = 1,\ldots,m : i \neq j; \quad \forall r = 1,\ldots,m-1. \tag{8}$$

$$y_{[i,r,j]} - x_{[j,r+1][i,r,j]} = 0;$$

$$\forall i,j = 1,\ldots,m : i \neq j; \quad \forall r = 1,\ldots,m-1. \tag{9}$$

- **Visit Requirements for Arcs**

$$y_{[i,r,j]} - \sum_{\substack{k=1\\k\notin\{i,j\}}}^{m} x_{[k,s][i,r,j]} = 0;$$

$$\forall i,j = 1,\ldots,m : i \neq j; \quad \forall r = 1,\ldots,m-1; \quad \forall s = 1,\ldots,m : s \notin \{r, r+1\}. \tag{10}$$

$$y_{[i,r,j]} - \sum_{\substack{s=1\\s\notin\{r,r+1\}}}^{m} x_{[u,s][i,r,j]} = 0;$$

$$\forall i,j,u = 1,\ldots,m : i \neq j \neq u; \quad \forall r = 1,\ldots,m-1. \tag{11}$$

- **Visit Requirements for Nodes**

$$\left(\sum_{p=1}^{r-2}\sum_{\substack{k=1\\k\notin\{i,u\}}}^{m} x_{[i,r][u,p,k]}\right) + x_{[i,r][u,r-1,i]} + x_{[i,r][i,r,u]} + \sum_{p=r+1}^{m-1}\sum_{\substack{k=1\\k\notin\{i,u\}}}^{m} x_{[i,r][k,p,u]}$$

$$- \left(\sum_{q=1}^{r-2}\sum_{\substack{l=1\\l\notin\{1,i\}}}^{m} x_{[i,r][1,q,l]}\right) - x_{[i,r][1,r-1,i]} - x_{[i,r][i,r,1]} - \sum_{q=r+1}^{m-1}\sum_{\substack{l=1\\l\notin\{1,i\}}}^{m} x_{[i,r][l,q,1]} = 0;$$

$$\forall i,u = 2,\ldots,m : i \neq u; \quad \forall r = 1,\ldots,m. \tag{12}$$

$$\left(\sum_{p=1}^{r-2}\sum_{\substack{k=2\\k\notin\{1,u\}}}^{m} x_{[1,r][u,p,k]}\right) + x_{[1,r][u,r-1,1]} + x_{[1,r][1,r,u]} + \sum_{p=r+1}^{m-1}\sum_{\substack{k=2\\k\notin\{1,u\}}}^{m} x_{[1,r][k,p,u]}$$

$$- \left(\sum_{q=1}^{r-2}\sum_{l=3}^{m} x_{[1,r][2,q,l]}\right) - x_{[1,r][2,r-1,1]} - x_{[1,r][1,r,2]} - \sum_{q=r+1}^{m-1}\sum_{l=3}^{m} x_{[1,r][l,q,2]} = 0;$$

$$\forall u = 3,\ldots,m; \quad \forall r = 1,\ldots,m. \tag{13}$$

- **Implicit Zeros**

$$y_{[i,r,j]} = 0 \quad \text{if } (i = j);$$

$$\forall i,j = 1,\ldots,m; \quad \forall r = 1,\ldots,m-1. \tag{14}$$

$$x_{[i,r][j,s,k]} = 0 \quad \text{if } ((i = k) \text{ or } (j = k) \text{ or } (s = r \text{ and } i \neq j) \text{ or } (s = r-1 \text{ and } i \neq k));$$

$$\forall i,j,k = 1,\ldots,m; \quad \forall r,s = 1,\ldots,m. \tag{15}$$

- **Nonnegativities**

$$y_{[i,r,j]} \geq 0; \ \forall i,j = 1,...,m; \quad \forall r = 1,...,m-1. \tag{16}$$

$$x_{[i,r][j,s,k]} \geq 0; \ \forall i,j,k = 1,...,m; \ \forall r = 1,...,m; \ \forall s = 1,...,m-1. \tag{17}$$

The overall logic of the model is described in eight steps below.

1. We have a model built over an Assignment flow graph. Constraint (1) creates an initial flow in x.

2. Constraints (2)-(5) are a set of Kirchoff Equations in x, keeping flow moving across *stages* in a connected and "balanced" mannner, as illustrated in Figure 4 below. For $p > r$, flow that nodes $[i,r]$ and $[u,p]$ have in common must leave $[i,r]$,and enter and leave $[u,p]$, and then leave $[u,p]$ (via some arcs at *stages* $(p-1)$ and $(p+1)$,respectively) in a balanced manner. In a similar way, for $p > r$, flow which is "destined" to $[u,p]$ must enter and leave $[i,r]$ (via some arcs at *stages* $(r-1)$ and $(r+1)$,respectively) in a blance manner, before entering $[u,p]$.

3. Constraints (6)-(7) stipulate that each pair of assignments induced by a y-variable elicits a "flow in = flow out" condition over a set of arcs (via the x-variables) for the nodes comprising the variable. These are illustrated in Figures 5 and 6.


r=1 r=2 r=3 r=4 r=5 r=6
i = 1
i = 2
i = 3
i = 4
i = 5
i = 6
Flow from ● is "balanced" at ◌.
(a): Constraints (2)
Flow from ◌ to ● is "balanced" at ◌.
(b): Constraints (3)
Total flow through ● is "balanced."
(c): Constraints (4)
Flow originating from ● is "balanced" at ◌
(d): Constraints (5)

Figure 4: Illustrations of the GKE/Mass Balance Constraints

4. Constraints (8) and (9), together, ensure that flow on a given arc, $[i, r, j]$, is "recognized" in the same way when viewed from either the tail node, $[i, r]$, or the head node, $[j, r+1]$, of the arc. This is illustrated in Figure 7 below.

5. Each set of consecutive assignment pairs must "visit" each *stage* via constraints (10). Figure 8 below illustrates this condition, which is that the total amount of flow a given arc, $[i, r, j]$, has in common with nodes at a given *stage*, s, is the the same for all s. (In other words, the sum of x-variables involving nodes at *stage* s and arc $[i, r, j]$ equals the flow from node $[i, r]$ to node $[j, r+1]$ (y-variable) for all s).

   Also, flow traversing a given arc, $[i, r, j]$, must "visit" (i.e., share value with) each *level* of the flow graph (city of the TSP) via constraints (11). This is illustrated in Figure 9.

6. A given node, $[i, r]$, must share the same amount of flow with every *level*, u, of the TSPFG.



Figure 5: Illustration of Reciprocity Constraints (6)

Constraints (12) enforce this condition for the case in which $i \neq 1$ by setting the total amount of flow shared with each $u \notin \{1, i\}$ equal to the total amount of flow shared with *level* "1". When $i = 1$, the condition is enforced by constraints (13) in which the total amount of flow shared with each $u \notin \{1, 2\}$ is set equal to the total amount of flow shared with *level* "2". These are illustrated in Figures 10 and 11.

7. Constraints (14)-(15) are used to restrict variables which by themselves would imply repeating a *level* (city) or a *stage*, or flow which is "broken" (by not "going out" of the node into which it "came in" at a *stage* involved in the variable). We call these "implicit zeros." In implementation, these variables are just not created.

8. Finally, constraints (16) and (17) are the usual nonnegativity constraints.

3.2.2 Intuition behind the model

A non-mathematical intuition for the idea of our modeling approach (to be formally described in the remainder of this paper) may be gained through the following observation. Assume that no part of a flow which traverses a given arc of the TSPFG can subsequently "re-visit" either of the *levels* (cities) of the graph that are involved in that arc. Then, flow can propagate forward through the graph, only in a "pattern" that consists of a convex combination of *TSP path*s. That is, we will show that each positive variable must lie on a *TSP path*. An x-variable being positive may be interpreted as a "communication" between the corresponding node and arc. The constraints are such that a node which has positive flow through it is made to "communicate" with pairs of nodes which are at consecutive *stages* at different parts of the network (through the x-variables) only along paths which are *TSP paths* of the network. As a result, feasible solutions of our proposed model are such that the total flow on each arc is a convex combination of flows along *TSP paths*


r=1
r=2
r=3
r=4
r=5
r=6
i = 1
i = 2
i = 3
i = 4
i = 5
i = 6
(Sums of flows/flow variables comprised of the "dashed" node plus a "dashed arc is equal to the Sum of the flows/flow variables comprised of the "solid" node plus one "solid" arc.)

Figure 6: Illustrations of Reciprocity Constraints (7)

only. This does not mean that every feasible solution to the model is a convex combination of flows along *TSP paths* only. The reason for this is that the model (the *Overall Polytope*) also has non-integral extreme points, due to the fact that the "pattern" of the y-variables may not be consistent with a single realization of the x-variables. We will show that the "flow pattern" of the y-variables is sufficient for being able to solve any TSP as a LP by utilizing an appropriate cost function which involves the y-variables only.

3.3 Objective Function

Our developments to follow in the remainder of this paper show that our approach is guaranted to correctly solve the TSP only when the travel costs are captured through the y-variables only. The reason for this is that our developments only show the integrality of the *y-Polytope*. Many variations of the objective function may be possible. The simplest one is used here placing the cost of traveling from city i to city j on the y-variables representing the total flows on the arcs. Two additional terms are added to account for node 0 being the starting and ending point of the travels. This is accomplished by adding the cost from node 0 to the first and last arcs chosen, connecting cities at *stages* 1 and 2 and cities at *stages* $m-1$ and m, respectively. The objective function we use is as follows:

$$\min \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m}(c_{0i}+c_{ij})y_{[i,1,j]} + \sum_{r=2}^{m-2}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{ij}y_{[i,r,j]} + \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m}(c_{ij}+c_{j0})y_{[i,m-1,j]} \tag{18}$$

4 Model structure

Notation 9



Figure 7: Illustration of the Flow Consistency Constraints

1. We denote the number of x-variables and y-variables in (1)-(17) by ξ_x and ξ_y, respectively.
2. We denote the polytope induced by (1)-(17) by Q, and refer to it as the "Overall (LP) Polytope." (i.e., $Q := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{\xi_x+\xi_y} : \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \text{ satisfies (1)-(17)} \right\}$ is referred to as the "Overall (LP) Polytope.")
3. We denote the projection of Q onto the space of the y-variables by "Y," and refer to it as the "y-Polytope." In other words, we refer to $Y := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^{\xi_y} : \left(\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^{\xi_x} : \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q \right) \right\}$ as the "y-Polytope."

Our objective in this section is to show that the *y-Polytope* is integral with extreme points corresponding to TSP tours. Note that this integrality does not imply the integrality of the *Overall Polytope*, even though the converse is true. The proof requires some preliminary notions and results which we will first discuss.

Definition 10 Let $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q$.

1. For $(r, s) \in R^2 : s > r$, we say that a set of nodes at consecutive *stages* of the TSPFG, $\{i_r, \ldots, i_s\}$, (or the set of arcs, $\{[i_r, r, i_{r+1}], \ldots, [i_{s-1}, s-1, i_s\}$, linking them in the TSPFG) is a "(r-to-s) TSP walk (of y)" if $i_r, \ldots, i_s$ are pairwise distinct and $y_{i_p,p,i_{p+1}} > 0$ for $p = 1, \ldots, m-1$.
2. We refer to a *TSP walk* of y which spans the set of *stages* of the TSPFG as a "TSP path (of y)" (since, clearly, every such spanning *TSP walk of* y corresponds to exactly one *TSP path* of the TSPFG).



Figure 8: Illustrations of the "Column Visit" Requirements for the Arcs

Remark 11 Let $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q$. By definitions 6 and 10.2 above, every *TSP path of* y corresponds to exactly one TSP tour.

Theorem 12 $\mathcal{V} := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q : \left(\exists (i_1, \ldots, i_m) \in M^m : \left(\forall (p,q) \in R^2 : p \neq q, \ \ (i_p \neq i_q; \text{ and } y_{i_p,p,i_{p+1}} = 1, \ p = 1, \ldots, m-1\right)\right)\right\} \subseteq Ext(Q)$.

Proof. We have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
1 &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{m} \sum_{k \notin \{i,j\}}^{m} x_{[i,1][j,2,k]} \quad \text{(Using (1))} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{m} \sum_{k \notin \{i,j\}}^{m} x_{[i,1][j,s,k]} \quad \forall s \in R \quad \text{(Using (2)-(5) recursively)} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq j}}^{m} y_{[j,s,k]} \quad \forall s \in R \quad \text{(Using (8)-(10)).} \qquad (19)
\end{aligned}
$$



Figure 9: Illustration of the "Row Visit" Requirements for the Arcs

(19) and the nonnegativity constraints (16)-(17) imply:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{V} \Longrightarrow$$

$$\forall s \in R,\ y_{[j,s,k]} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j \text{ and } k \text{ are the levels included in the existentially-quantified set of the theorem for stages } s \text{ and } s+1 \text{ (i.e., if } j = i_s \text{ and } k = i_{s+1}); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

(20) implies:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{V} \Longrightarrow y \in \{0,1\}^{\xi_y}. \tag{21}$$

It is easy to verify that:

$$\left(\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q \text{ and } y \in \{0,1\}^{\xi_y} \right) \Longrightarrow x \in \{0,1\}^{\xi_x}. \tag{22}$$

(21) and (22) imply:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{V} \Longrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \{0,1\}^{\xi_x + \xi_y}. \tag{23}$$

Clearly, 0 and 1 (respectively) cannot be represented as non-trivial convex combinations of numbers on the interval $[0,1]$. It follows from the combination of this with (22) and (23) that a given $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{V}$ cannot be represented as a convex combination of other points of Q. ■



Figure 10: Illustration of the "Row Visit" Requirement for Node (i, r), When $i > 1$.

Theorem 12 shows that even though a *TSP path for* $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q$ is defined in terms of conditions on y only, its (mathematical) correspondence to an extreme point of Q is preserved. Our aim in this section is to show that each extreme point of the *y-Polytope* (Y) is a *TSP path for* a $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q$ (and therefore, corresponds to a *TSP path* of the TSPFG (and therefore, to a TSP tour)). Note that, as we have indicated above, the integrality of Y does not imply that of Q. The reason for this is that an extreme point of Q may *project* to a non-extreme point of Y. A conceptual illustration of this fact is given in Figure 12.

Remark 13 An observation which can be made from Figure 12 is that the y-component of any point of "Q" (in the figure) must be a convex combination of the extreme points of "Y" (in the figure). The y-components of "C", "D", "E", and "F" in particular, must respectively be convex combinations of "A" and "H". Hence, as can be also seen from the figure, provided the objective function in an LP over "Q" (in the figure) is expressed in terms of the y-variables only, at least one the extreme points of "Y" (either "A" or "H" (or both) in the figure) must be optimal. In this way, for our purposes in this paper, the integrality of the projection of the *Overall Polytope* onto the space of a class of its variables happens to be sufficient for the optimizatin problem at hand. This sufficiency is the consequence of the combination of the fact that the projection is integral with the fact that it is possible to correctly capture TSP tour costs using the variables being "projected to" only in our modeling.

The following notation is needed in order to develop the subsequent three lemmas (Lemmas 15-17) which establish some "connectivity" conditions between a node and an arc of the TSPFG which share flow in our model (through the x-variables). Lemma 17 is the "main" lemma (among the three) and shows the existence of a *TSP walk* for every (node, arc) pair of the TSPFG which share flow. Lemmas 15 and 16 provide the foundation for the induction used in proving Lemma 17.

Notation 14 Let $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q$. We define the following:



Figure 11: Illustration of the "Row Visit" Requirement for Node (i, r), When $i = 1$.

1. $\forall\left((i,r),[j,s,k]\right) \in \left(\overline{N},\overline{A}\right) : \left(s > r;\ x_{[i,r][j,s,k]} > 0\right)$,

   (a) $U_{irjsk} := \left\{u \in M : x_{[u,s-1][j,s,k]} > 0\right\}$;

   (b) $V_{irjsk} := \left\{v \in M : x_{[i,r][v,s-1,j]} > 0\right\}$.

2. $\forall\left((i,r),[j,s,k]\right) \in \left(\overline{N},\overline{A}\right) : \left(s < r;\ x_{[i,r][j,s,k]} > 0\right)$,

   (a) $\overline{U}_{irjsk} := \left\{u \in M : x_{[u,s+2][j,s,k]} > 0\right\}$;

   (b) $\overline{V}_{irjsk} := \left\{v \in M : x_{[i,r][k,s+1,v]} > 0\right\}$.

Lemma 15 Let $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q$. Then, the following is true:

$$\forall (i,r) \in \overline{N},\ \forall [j,s,k] \in \overline{A} : s > r+1,\ \left(x_{[i,r][j,s,k]} > 0 \Rightarrow U_{irjsk} \cap V_{irjsk} \neq \varnothing\right).$$

Proof. Assume

$$U_{irjsk} \cap V_{irjsk} = \varnothing. \tag{24}$$



Figure 12: General Illustration of a Non-Integral Polytope Projecting to an Integral Polytope

Then, we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
y_{[j,s,k]} &= \sum_{\substack{u=1 \\ u \notin \{j,k\}}}^{m} x_{[u,s-1][j,s,k]} \quad \text{(Using (10))} \\
&= \sum_{u \in U_{irjsk}}^{m} x_{[u,s-1][j,s,k]} \quad \text{(Using (24) and the definitions in Notation 14)} \\
&= \sum_{u \in (M \setminus \{i,j,k\})} x_{[u,r][j,s,k]} \quad \text{(Using (24), (14)-(15), and applying (2)-(5) recursively)} \\
&< \left(\sum_{u \in (M \setminus \{i,j,k\})} x_{[u,r][j,s,k]} \right) + x_{[i,r][j,s,k]} \quad = \sum_{u \in (M \setminus \{j,k\})} x_{[u,r][j,s,k]} \\
&\text{(Since } x_{[i,r][j,s,k]} > 0 \text{ by assumption).} \qquad (25)
\end{aligned}
$$

(25) contradicts (8)-(10). Hence, we must have:

$U_{irjsk} \cap V_{irjsk} \neq \varnothing$.

■

Lemma 16 Let $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q$. Then, the following is true:

$$\forall (i,r) \in \overline{N},\ \forall [j,s,k] \in \overline{A} : (s < r-1),\ \left(x_{[i,r][j,s,k]} > 0 \Rightarrow \overline{U}_{irjsk} \cap \overline{V}_{irjsk} \neq \varnothing \right).$$

Proof. Assume

$$\overline{U}_{irjsk} \cap \overline{V}_{irjsk} = \varnothing. \tag{26}$$

Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{[j,s,k]} &= \sum_{\substack{u=1 \\ u \notin \{j,k\}}}^{m} x_{[u,s+2][j,s,k]} \quad \text{(Using (10))} \\ &= \sum_{u \in \overline{U}_{irjsk}} x_{[u,s+2][j,s,k]} \quad \text{(Using (26) and the definitions in Notation 14)} \\ &= \sum_{u \in (M \setminus \{i,j,k\})} x_{[u,r][j,s,k]} \quad \text{(Using (26) and (14)-(15), and applying (2)-(5) recursively)} \\ &< \left(\sum_{u \in (M \setminus \{i,j,k\})} x_{[u,r][j,s,k]} \right) + x_{[i,r][j,s,k]} \quad = \sum_{u \in (M \setminus \{j,k\})} x_{[u,r][j,s,k]} \end{aligned}$$

(Since $x_{[i,r][j,s,k]} > 0$ by assumption). (27)

(27) contradicts (8)-(10). Hence, we must have:

$$\overline{U}_{irjsk} \cap \overline{V}_{irjsk} \neq \varnothing.$$

■

Lemma 17 Let $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q$. Then, the following are true:

1. $\forall (r,s) \in R^2 : r \leq s < m,\ x_{[i_r,r][i_s,s,i_{s+1}]} > 0 \Rightarrow \exists (i_t,\ t = r, \ldots, s+1) \in M^{s-r+2}$:
   $\left(\forall (p,q) \in \{i_r, \ldots, i_{s+1}\}^2 : p \neq q,\ i_p \neq i_q\right)$; and $\left(y_{i_p,p,i_{p+1}} > 0,\ p = r, \ldots, s\right)$.
2. $\forall (r,s) \in R^2 : s < r,\ x_{[i_r,r][i_s,s,i_{s+1}]} > 0 \Rightarrow \exists (i_t,\ t = s, \ldots, r) \in M^{r-s+1}$:
   $\left(\forall (p,q) \in \{i_s, \ldots, i_r\}^2 : p \neq q, i_p \neq i_q\right)$; and $\left(y_{i_p,p,i_{p+1}} > 0,\ p = s, \ldots, r-1\right)$.

Proof. Observe that because of constraints (6)-(9), the two statements of the lemma are equivalent. Hence, it is suffucient to prove only one of the two statements. We will provide the proof for statement 1.

Case 1: $\mathbf{s = r}$.

(8) and (14)-(15) $\Longrightarrow$:

$$x_{[i_r,r][i_r,r,i_{r+1}]} > 0 \Longrightarrow \left(i_r \neq i_{r+1},\ \text{and } y_{[i_r,r,i_{r+1}]} > 0\right) \tag{28}$$

Statement 1 of the lemma for this case follows from (28) directly.

Case 2: $\mathbf{s = r + 1}$.

(10) and (14)-(15) $\Longrightarrow$:

$$x_{[i_r,r][i_{r+1},r+1,i_{r+2}]} > 0 \Longrightarrow \left(i_r \neq i_{r+1} \neq i_{r+2} \text{ and } y_{[i_{r+1},r+1,i_{r+2}]} > 0\right). \tag{29}$$

Also, (6) implies:

$$x_{[i_r,r][i_{r+1},r+1,i_{r+2}]} > 0 \Longrightarrow x_{[i_{r+2},r+2][i_r,r,i_{r+1}]} > 0. \tag{30}$$

Using (10), we have:

$$x_{[i_{r+2},r+2][i_r,r,i_{r+1}]} > 0 \Longrightarrow y_{[i_r,r,i_{r+1}]} > 0. \tag{31}$$

Statement 1 of the lemma for this case follows from (29)-(31) directly.

Case 3: $\mathbf{s \geq r+2}$.

The proof for this case is inductive. We will show that if the theorem holds for $(r, r+\delta) \in R^2$, then the lemma must also hold for $(r, r+\delta+1) \in R^2$ (where $1 \leq \delta \leq m-r-1$).

Assume that, for a given δ, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(a) \forall (r, r+\delta) \in R^2 : r+\delta < m,\ x_{[i_r,r][i_{r+\delta},r+\delta,i_{r+\delta+1}]} > 0 \Rightarrow \\
&\quad \exists (i_{r+1}, \ldots, i_{r+\delta-1}) \in M^{\delta-1} : \big(\big(\forall (p,q) \in \{r, \ldots, r+\delta+1\}^2 : p \neq q,\ i_p \neq i_q \big) ; \\
&\quad \big(y_{i_p,p,i_{p+1}} > 0 \text{ for } p = r, \ldots, r+\delta \big) \big) ; \text{ and} \qquad (32) \\
&(b) (i_r, i_{r+\delta+1}, i_{r+\delta+2}) \in M^3 \text{ are such that } x_{[i_r,r][i_{r+\delta+1},r+\delta+1,i_{r+\delta+2}]} > 0. \qquad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

We will show that there must exist a *r-to-*$(r+\delta+2)$ *TSP walk of* y.

Using (2), (5), (7), (10), and (14)-(15), (33) implies:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(a)\ i_r \neq i_{r+\delta+1} \neq i_{r+\delta+2}; \qquad (34) \\
&(b)\ y_{[i_{r+\delta+1},r+\delta+1,i_{r+\delta+2}]} > 0; \qquad (35) \\
&(c)\ L := U_{i_r,r,i_{r+\delta+1},r+\delta+1,i_{r+\delta+2}} \cap V_{i_r,r,i_{r+\delta+1},r+\delta+1,i_{r+\delta+2}} \neq \varnothing; \qquad (36) \\
&(d)\ K := \{k \in M : x_{[i_{r+\delta},i_{r+\delta+2},r+\delta+2][i_r,r,k]} > 0\} \neq \varnothing; \text{ and} \qquad (37) \\
&(d)\ \forall k \in K,\ \overline{L}_k := \overline{U}_{i_{r+\delta+2},r+\delta+2,i_r,r,k} \cap \overline{V}_{i_{r+\delta+2},r+\delta+2,i_r,r,k} \neq \varnothing \qquad (38)
\end{aligned}$$

From "Case 2" and the definitions in Notation 14, we must have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall u_{r+\delta} \in L,\ \exists (u_{r+1}, \ldots, u_{r+\delta-1}) \in M^{\delta-1} : \big(\big(\forall (p,q) \in \{r, \ldots, r+\delta+1\}^2 : \\
&\ p \neq q,\ u_p \neq u_q \big) ; \text{ and } \big(y_{u_p,p,u_{p+1}} > 0 \text{ for } p = r, \ldots, r+\delta \big) \big) . \text{ (Where } i_r \\
&\text{and } i_{r+\delta+1} \text{ have been relabled as } u_r \text{ and } u_{r+\delta+1}, \text{ respectively).} \qquad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we must also have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall v_{r+1} \in \bigcup_{k \in K} \overline{L}_k,\ \exists (v_{r+2}, \ldots, v_{r+\delta}) \in M^{\delta-1} : \big(\big(\forall (p,q) \in \{r+1, \ldots, r+\delta+2\}^2 : \\
&\ p \neq q,\ v_p \neq v_q \big) ; \text{ and } \big(y_{v_p,p,v_{p+1}} > 0 \text{ for } p = r+1, \ldots, r+\delta+1 \big) \big) . \text{ (Where } i_{r+\delta+1} \\
&\text{and } i_{r+\delta+2} \text{ have been relabled as } v_{r+\delta+1} \text{ and } v_{r+\delta+2}, \text{ respectively).} \qquad (40)
\end{aligned}$$

Conclusion. By (11)-(12), at least one of the $r-to-(r+\delta+1)$ *TSP walks* specified in (39) and one of the $(r+1)-to-(r+\delta+2)$ *TSP walks* specified in (40) must overlap in their components between *stages* $(r+1)$ and $(r+\delta+1)$. (If not, constraints (11)-(13) would be violated for nodes i_r and $i_{r+\delta+2}$, and arc $[i_{r+\delta+1}, r+\delta+1, i_{r+\delta+2}]$ when $r=1$ and $\delta=m-3$, in particular.) Statement 1 of the lemma follows from this directly. ■

We will now discuss some topological properties of Q and Y which will be needed in order to prove our main result, which is the integrality of Y.

Definition 18 Let λ be a scalar on the interval $(0,1]$.

1. We refer to $\widetilde{Q}_\lambda := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{\xi_x+\xi_y} : \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \text{ satisfies (41), and (2)-(17)} \right\}$ as the "λ-scaled Overall Polytope," where (41) is specified as:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j\neq i}}^{m} \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k\notin\{i,j\}}}^{m} x_{(i,1)(j,2,k)} = \lambda. \tag{41}$$

2. We refer to the projection of $\widetilde{Q}_\lambda$ onto the space of the y-variables as the "λ-scaled y-Polytope," and denote it by $\widetilde{Y}_\lambda$. In other words, we refer to $\widetilde{Y}_\lambda := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^{\xi_y} : \left(\exists x \in \mathbb{R}^{\xi_x} : \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{Q}_\lambda \right) \right\}$ as the "λ-scaled y-Polytope."

Lemma 19 $\forall (\lambda, \mu) \in (0,1]^2 : \lambda \neq \mu$,

1. $\widetilde{Q}_\lambda$ and $\widetilde{Q}_\mu$ are homeomorphic;
2. $\widetilde{Y}_\lambda$ and $\widetilde{Y}_\mu$ are homeomorphic.

Proof.

1. *$\widetilde{Q}_\lambda$ and $\widetilde{Q}_\mu$ are homeomorphic.*

   It is easy to see (by observing the result of the multiplication of each of the constraints of Q by a (same) constant, for example) that:

$$\forall \alpha \in (0,1],\ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q \Longleftrightarrow \alpha \cdot \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{Q}_\alpha. \tag{42}$$

   Hence, the point-to-point mapping

$$h_\alpha : Q \longrightarrow \widetilde{Q}_\alpha \text{ with } h_\alpha \left(\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \right) = \alpha \cdot \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \tag{43}$$

   is bijective. Also, clearly, $\forall \alpha \in (0,1]$, h_α is bicontinuous (see Gamelin and Greene (1999, pp. 26-27), or Panik (1993, pp. 267-268)). Hence, $\forall \alpha \in (0,1]$, h_α is a homeomorphism (see Gamelin and Greene (1999, pp. 27, 67), or Panik (1993, pp. 253-257)). The homeomorphism between $\widetilde{Q}_\lambda$ and $\widetilde{Q}_\mu$ follows directly from the equivalence property of homeomorphisms (since $\widetilde{Q}_\lambda$ and $\widetilde{Q}_\mu$ are respectively homeomorphic to Q).

2. $\widetilde{Y}_\lambda$ *and* $\widetilde{Y}_\mu$ *are homeomorphic.*

   Clearly, the conditions expressed in (42)-(43) are applicable to the y-component vector of $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q$. The lemma follows from this, in a similar way as for Part (1) of the proof above.

■

A direct result of the combination of Lemmas 17 and 19 is the following.

Corollary 20

$$\forall \lambda \in (0,1],\ y \in \widetilde{Y}_\lambda \implies \text{There exists at least one } \textit{TSP path of } y. \tag{44}$$

Notation 21 $\forall \lambda \in (0,1]$, $\forall y \in \widetilde{Y}_\lambda$, define:

1. $\Pi_\lambda(y)$: Set of *TSP paths* of y;
2. $\mathcal{T}_\lambda(y) := \{1, \ldots, |\Pi(y)|\}$ (Index set associated with $\Pi(y)$);
3. $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(y)$, $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,t}(y) := \left\{[i_{\lambda,t,k}, k, i_{\lambda,t,k+1}] \in \overline{A},\ k = 1, \ldots, m-1\right\}$ (t^{th} *TSP path* of y);
4. $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(y)$, $\widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y)$: Characteristic vector of $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,t}(y)$ ($\widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y)$ is obtained by setting the y-variable for each arc involved in $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,t}(y)$ to "1", and setting the y-variable for each arc not involved in $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda,t}(y)$ to "0".).

We have the following results.

Lemma 22 Let $\lambda \in (0,1]$ and $y \in \widetilde{Y}_\lambda$. Then, the following is true:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(y),\ \exists \varepsilon \in (0,1] : (y - \varepsilon \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y)) \in \widetilde{Y}_{\lambda-\varepsilon} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}.$$

Proof.

From (42) in the proof of Lemma 19 and the fact that $\widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y)$ is a point of Y, we must have:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(y),\ \ (\lambda \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y)) \in \widetilde{Y}_\lambda. \tag{45}$$

By the convexity of $\widetilde{Y}_\lambda$, (45) implies:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(y),\ \exists \left\langle \alpha \in (0,1],\ \overline{y} \in \widetilde{Y}_\lambda \cup \{\mathbf{0}\} \right\rangle : \langle y = (\alpha \cdot (\lambda \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y)) + (1-\alpha) \cdot \overline{y}) \rangle . \tag{46}$$

From (46), we have:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(y),\ \alpha = 1 \Longrightarrow (1-\alpha) \cdot \overline{y} = y - \lambda \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y) = \mathbf{0}. \tag{47}$$

Hence, it suffices to set $\varepsilon = 1$ in order for the lemma to hold when $y = \lambda \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y)$.

Now, consider $t \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(y) : y \neq \lambda \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y)$. Using (46), we have:

$$\exists \left\langle \alpha \in (0,1),\ \overline{y} \in \widetilde{Y}_\lambda \right\rangle : \langle y - \alpha \cdot (\lambda \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y)) = (1-\alpha) \cdot \overline{y} \rangle . \tag{48}$$

Letting $\alpha\lambda = \varepsilon$, we get from (48) that:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(y) : y \neq \lambda \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y), \quad (y - \varepsilon \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y)) \in \widetilde{Y}_{\lambda(1-\alpha)} = \widetilde{Y}_{\lambda-\varepsilon}. \tag{49}$$

The lemma follows directly from the combination of (47) and (49). ■

Our main result for this section will now be discussed.

Theorem 23 The *y-Polytope* is integral with each extreme point corresponding to a *TSP path* of a point of Y. In other words, every extreme point of Y is integral and corresponds to a *TSP path* of a point of Y.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in (0,1]$, $y \in \widetilde{Y}_\lambda$. $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(y)$, let:

$$f_{\lambda_t,t}(\overline{y}^t) := \max\left\{\varepsilon \in (0,1] : (y - \varepsilon \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda,t}(y)) \in \widetilde{Y}_{\lambda-\varepsilon} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}\right\} \tag{50}$$

Then, clearly, from Lemma 22, we must have:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(y), \quad f_{\lambda_t,t}(\overline{y}^t) > 0. \tag{51}$$

Now, consider the "Iterative Elimination (IE)" procedure below:

Step 0 (Initialization)
(0.1) : **set** $\lambda_1 = 1$
(0.2) : **set** $\overline{y}^1 = y$
(0.4) : **set** $t = 1$
Step 1 (Iterative step)
(1.1) : **choose** a (arbitrary) *TSP path* of $\overline{y}^t$, $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$
(1.2) : **set** $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_t,t}(\overline{y}^t) = \overline{\mathcal{P}}$
(1.3) : **compute** $f_{\lambda_t,t}(\overline{y}^t)$; (Using (50))
(1.4) : **compute** $\overline{y}^{t+1} = \overline{y}^t - f_{\lambda_t,t}(\overline{y}^t) \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda_t,t}(\overline{y}^t)$; (Using Notation 21)
Step 2 (Stopping criterion)
(2.1) : **If** $\overline{y}^{t+1} = \mathbf{0}$, **stop**
(2.2) : **Otherwise**:
- **compute** $\lambda_{t+1} = \lambda_t - f_{\lambda_t,t}(\overline{y}^t)$
- **set** $t = t + 1$
- **go to** Step 1.

Table 1: Summary of the "Iterative Elimination (IE)" procedure

Clearly, it follows directly from the combination of (51) and Lemma 22 above that this procedure must stop.

Letting the number of iterations of the procedure when it stops be ν, we must have:

$$\begin{cases} (i) \quad \sum\limits_{t=1}^{\nu} \left(f_{\lambda_t,t}(\overline{y}^t)\right) = \lambda_1 = 1; \quad \text{and} \\ (ii) \quad y = \overline{y}^1 = \sum\limits_{t=1}^{\nu} \left(f_{\lambda_t,t}(\overline{y}^t) \cdot \widehat{w}_{\lambda_t,t}(\overline{y}^t)\right) \end{cases} \tag{52}$$

Also, clearly, we have:

$$f_{\lambda_t,t}(\overline{y}^t) > 0 \text{ for } t = 1, \ldots, \nu. \tag{53}$$

It follows from the combination of the *Minkowski-Weyl Theorem* (Minskowski (1910); Weyl (1935); see also Rockafellar (1997, pp.153-172)) that (52)-(53) imply that every extreme point of Y is the characteristic vector of a *TSP path* of a point of Y. The theorem follows from this directly. ■

Corollary 24 The optimization model comprised of Objective Function (18) and Constraints (1)-(17) correctly solves the TSP.

Proof. For $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q$, write Objective Function (18) as $c^t \cdot y$. Denote the value of the optimization problem by $\mathfrak{V}^*$ and let $\begin{pmatrix} x^* \\ y^* \end{pmatrix}$ be an optimal solution. Clearly, $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in Q$ implies that y is a convex combination of extreme points of Y. Hence, there must exist p ($p \geq 1$) extreme points of Y, $\widehat{y}_1, \ldots, \widehat{y}_p$, and scalars $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_p$ ($\alpha_i \in (0, 1]$, $i = 1 \ldots, p$; $\sum_{i=1}^{p} \alpha_i = 1$) such that the following are true:

$$\mathfrak{V}^* = c^t \cdot y^* = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \alpha_i \left(c^t \cdot \widehat{y}_i \right) \tag{54}$$

$$= c^t \cdot \widehat{y}_i \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, p. \text{ (Since we must have } \mathfrak{V}^* \leq c^t \cdot \widehat{y}_i \text{ for all } i.) \tag{55}$$

Now, by Theorem 23, each $\widehat{y}_i$ ($i = 1, \ldots, p$) in (54)-(55) corresponds to a *TSP path* of a point of Y, and therefore (by Theorem 7 and Remark 11) to a TSP tour. ■

Remark 25 Clearly, because of Theorem 23, any off-the-shelf, standard LP solver can be used in order to solve our model. When the TSP at hand has a unique optimum, then any solver would stop with that optimum. On the other hand, when there are multiple optima and an interior-point method is used (or, perhaps, due to numerical issues), the solution obtained may be a convex combination of those optima. In such a case, formal procedures exist, which can be used in order to obtain a vertex optimum (which, according to Theorem 23, would correspond to exactly one of the optimal tours of the TSP at hand). In particular, the "Normal Perturbation" approach of Mangasarian (1984) can be used in order to perturb the LP costs, and thereby "make" the LP into one in which one of the alternate optima becomes the unique optimum. A polynomial-time interior-point method which stops at a vertex solution only (see Wright (1997; pp. 137-157) could be used also, perhaps in combination with the *Normal Pertubation* approach. In our substantial emprical testing (to be described in the next section), we used a heuristic implementation of the IE procedure described in the proof of Theorem 23 above. In all cases, this heuristic implementation was successful at "retrieving" at least one of the optimal TSP tours comprising the solution.

Example 26 We illustrate Theorem 23 and Remark 25 using a 8-city TSP we solved using the barrier method of CPLEX without crossover and thus stopping on a face, as follows:

- **Travel costs**:

	To:								
From:	--	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	0	--	13	56	40	13	41	26	52
	1	13	--	52	43	20	40	39	40
	2	56	52	--	95	47	17	73	72
	3	40	43	95	--	52	81	42	61
	4	13	20	47	52	--	30	28	60
	5	41	40	17	81	30	--	56	68
	6	26	39	73	42	28	56	--	77
	7	52	40	72	61	60	68	77	--

- **Optimal solution obtained:**
  - **Solution Value**: 281.000.
  - **Postive y-variables:**

Variable	Value
y(1,1,4)	0.279
y(4,1,5)	0.221
y(6,1,3)	0.500
y(3,2,7)	0.500
y(4,2,5)	0.279
y(5,2,2)	0.221
y(2,3,1)	0.221
y(5,3,2)	0.279
y(7,3,1)	0.221
y(7,3,2)	0.279
y(1,4,2)	0.221
y(1,4,7)	0.221
y(2,4,5)	0.279
y(2,4,7)	0.279
y(2,5,5)	0.221
y(5,5,4)	0.279
y(7,5,3)	0.500
y(3,6,6)	0.500
y(4,6,1)	0.279
y(5,6,4)	0.221

- **TSP tours "retrieved" using the IE procedure-based heuristic:**

TSP Tour in Solution	Tour "Weight"	Unweighted Tour Cost	Weighted Tour Cost
0-1-4-5-2-7-3-6-0	0.279	281.000	78.465
0-4-5-2-1-7-3-6-0	0.221	281.000	62.035
0-6-3-7-1-2-5-4-0	0.221	281.000	62.035
0-6-3-7-2-5-4-1-0	0.279	281.000	78.465
TOTAL	1.000	--	281.000

(Note: 0.221 + 0.279 = 0.500. This is consistent with y(6,1,3) = 0.500, for example.)

- **Illustration on the TSPFG:**



□

5 Model size and empirical testing

We have run over a million test problems using the interior point (barrier) methods of CPLEX. In all of the cases with multiple optima, our heuristic implementation of the Iterative Elimination procedure described above (in the proof of Theorem 23) was sufficient in "retrieving" at least one of the optimal TSP tours comprising the final LP solution obtained. The optimal TSP tour lengths were also verified by using the Miller-Tucker-Zemlin (1960) model and solving the corresponding integer program using CPLEX. Through our empirical experimentations we found that either constraints (11) or constraints (12) (but not both at the same time) could be left out of the model

and still have it solve correctly. Since, the number of the constraints (12) is much smaller than that of constraints (11), we only used constraints (12) in all of the computational experiments we are reporting in this paper. We solved the problems using the CPLEX option of barrier without crossover as it results in much faster solution times, the reason being that even if we stop on a face our iterative procedure is much faster than having CPLEX use crossover and try to get to a vertex. The figures below represent problems solved on a Dell Precision Tower 5810 XCTO Base (210-ACQM)—-64GB (4x16GB) 2133MHz DDR4 RDIMM ECC (370-ABWB) —Integrated Intel AHCI chipset SATA controller (6 x 6.0Gb/s) SW RAID 0/1/5/10 (403-BBGV). Table 2 shows the size and solutions times of problems with 7 to 22 cities. (Although, not reported in this poaper, using a higher-memory (but slower) computer, we were able to solve problems as large as 27 cities.) Each of the times shown in Table 2 is the average of five (5) problems. These problems were symmetric euclidean distance based randomly generated problems. In detail, we used a 100 by 100 grid and modified the distances to between 90%-110% of their true values and rounded distances to be integer. Similar results were obtained using exact euclidean distances, using uniform distributions for distances, and choices of symmetric/asymmetric/integer or non-integer values.

n	Number of Variables	Number of Constraints	CPU Time		
			seconds	minutes	hours
7	3138	2353	0.097	0.002	2.70613E-05
8	7546	4810	0.566	0.01	0.000157246
9	16056	8825	1.597	0.03	0.000443744
10	31086	14950	4.854	0.08	0.001348231
11	47641	23821	9.414	0.16	0.002615135
12	72315	36158	19.979	0.33	0.005549658
13	152436	52765	53.160	0.89	0.014766803
14	235846	74530	116.455	1.94	0.032348597
15	352506	102425	221.501	3.69	0.061528073
16	511530	137506	582.892	9.71	0.161914461
17	723568	180913	1101.027	18.35	0.305840896
18	1000926	233870	2426.070	40.43	0.673908458
19	1357686	297685	6136.018	102.27	1.704449444
20	1809826	373750	7869.504	131.16	2.185973401
21	2375340	463541	15489.150	258.15	4.302541667
22	3074358	568618	25405.47337	423.42	7.057075937

Table 2: Problem size and solution time

Figures 13 and 14 below graphically display the increase in the number of variables as n (the number of cities) ranges from 7 to 22. Figure 15 shows how the number of constraints grows with respect to the number of variables.

While the complexity order of size of the model is $O(n^5)$, we found that a regression equation using a polynomial of order n^3 fits the model size with coefficients of determination which are close to 1.000 (greater that 0.999, to be more precise). This is likely due to the many "implicit zero" variables in the model. We also note that the number of constraints grows more slowly than the number of variables as can be seen in Figure 15. We certainly recognize that while this model is not computationally competitive with other approaches, it does provide motivation to explore other models/algorithms with the knowledge that the complexity classes "P" and "NP" are equal. Also, further research may uncover ways to streamline the proposed LP, enough to make it practical.



Figure 13: Graph of the number of variables versus the number of cities



Figure 14: Graph of the number of constraints versus the number of cities



Figure 15: Graph of the number of constraints versus the number of variables

The model presented here can be modified in many ways. For example, clearly, a straightforward alternate model could be obtained by substituting out the y-variables, resulting in a model described in x-variable space only. What we have shown here is the model we found easiest to describe and understand.

6 Conclusions

We have presented a polynomial-sized linear program for the n-city TSP drawing upon "complex flow modeling" ideas. We used an Assignment problem-based abstraction of tours not employing the traditional city-to-city variables of the standard TSP formulation. Integer solutions were obtained in the case of unique optima, and a simple iterative procedure was used to obtain one or more of the optimal TSP routes in the case of alternate optima. We have solved more than one million problems with up to 27 cities using the barrier methods of CPLEX, consistently obtaining all integer solutions, consistent with our theoretical developments. Our work complements our earlier affirmation resolving the important "P versus NP" question. It accomplishes this with a much smaller model than that developed previously by the first two authors.

Paraphrasing/quoting from Diaby and Karwan (2016a), we conclude:

'Our developments (and their incidental consequence of "$P = NP$") remove the exponential shift in complexity, but do not suggest a collapse of the "continuum of difficulty," nor any change in the sequence along that continuum. In other words, our developments do not imply (or suggest) that all of the problems in the NP class have become equally "easy" to solve in practice. The suggestion is that, in theory, for NP problems, the "continuum of difficulty" actually ranges from low-degree-polynomial time complexity to increasingly-higher-degree-polynomial time complexities.

However, from a theoretical perspective, we believe that these results make it necessary to re-frame the computational complexity question away from: "Does there exist a polynomial algorithm for Problem X?" to (perhaps): What is the smallest-dimensional space in which Problem X has a polynomial algorithm?'

References

[1] Bazaraa, M.S., J.J. Jarvis and H.D. Sherali (2010). *Linear Programming and Network Flows*. Wiley, New York, NY.

[2] Beachy, J.A. and W.D. Blair (2006). *Abstract Algebra*. Waveland Press, Inc., Long Grove, IL.

[3] Braun, G., S. Fiorini, S. Pokutta, and D. Steurer (2015). Approximation Limits of Linear Programs (Beyond Hierarchies). *Mathematics of Operations Research* 40:3, pp. 756–772.

[4] Diaby, M. (2007). The traveling salesman problem: A linear programming formulation. *WSEAS Transactions on Mathematics* 6:6, pp. 745–754.

[5] Diaby, M. (2010a). Linear programming formulation of the multi-depot multiple traveling salesman problem with differentiated travel costs. In D. Davendra (ed.), *Traveling Salesman Problem, Theory and Applications*. InTech, New York, NY, pp. 257–282.

[6] Diaby, M. (2010b). Linear programming formulation of the set partitioning problem. *International Journal of Operational Research* 8:4, pp. 399–427.

[7] Diaby, M. (2010c). Linear programming formulation of the vertex coloring problem. *International Journal of Mathematics in Operational Research* 2:3, pp. 259–289.

[8] Diaby, M. and M.H. Karwan (2016a). *Advances in Combinatorial Optimization: Linear Programming Formulations of the Traveling Salesman and Other Hard Combinatorial Optimization Problems*. World Scientific Publishing, Singapore.

[9] Diaby, M. and M.H. Karwan (2016b). "Limits to the scope of applicability of extended formulations," *International Journal of Mathematics in Operational Research* (Forthcoming).

[10] Fiorini, S., S. Massar, S. Pokutta, H.R. Tiwary, and R. de Wolf (2011). Linear vs. Semidefinite Extended Formulations: Exponential Separation and Strong Bounds. *Unpublished* (Available at: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1111.0837.pdf).

[11] Fiorini, S., S. Massar, S. Pokutta, H.R. Tiwary, and R. de Wolf (2012). Linear vs. Semidefinite Extended Formulations: Exponential Separation and Strong Bounds. *Proceedings of the 44^{th} ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing* (*STOC '12*), New York, NY, pp. 95-106.

[12] Fiorini, S., S. Massar, S. Pokutta, H.R. Tiwary, and R. de Wolf (2015). Exponential Lower Bounds for Polytopes in Combinatorial Optimization. *Journal of the ACM* 62:2, Article No. 17.

[13] Gamelin, T.W. and R.E. Greene (1999). *Introduction to Topology*. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY.

[14] Garey, M.R. and D.S. Johnson (1979). *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. Freeman and Company, New York, NY.

[15] Lawler, E.L., J.K. Lenstra, A.H.G. Rinnooy Kan, and D.B. Shmoys (1985), eds. *The Traveling Salesman Problem: A Guided Tour of Combinatorial Optimization* (Wiley, New York).

[16] Mangasarian, O.L. (1984). Normal solutions of linear programs. *Mathematical Programming Study* 22, pp. 206–216.

[17] Miller, C.E., A.W. Tucker and R.A. Zemlin (1960). Integer programming formulations and traveling salesman problems. *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery* 7:4, pp. 326–329.

[18] Minkowski, H. (1910). *Geometrie der Zahlen*. Teubner, Leipzig.

[19] Öncan, T., K. Altinel and G, Laporte (2009). A comparative analysis of several asymmetric traveling salesman problem formulations. *Computers & Operations Research* 36:3, pp. 637–654.

[20] Panik, M.J. (1993). *Fundamentals of Convex Analysis*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA.

[21] Rockaffelar, R. T. (1997). *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press.

[22] Weyl, H. (1935). Elementare Theorie der konvexen Polyheder. *Commentarii Math. Helvetici 7*, pp. 290-306.

[23] Wright, S.J. (1997). *Primal-Dual Interior-Point Methods*. SIAM.

[24] Yannakakis, M. (1991). Expressing combinatorial optimization problems by linear programming. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 43:3, pp. 441-466.

[25] Yannakakis, M. (2013). *Private Email Communications.*

Appendix A: Non-applicability of developments for "*The* TSP Polytope."

Our model does not require the city-to-city traditional variables that are used in describing the standard TSP Polytope (i.e., "*The* TSP Polytope"; see Lawler *et al.* (1985), or Diaby and Karwan (2016a; 2016b) for exact definition). Hence, our modeling does not involve "*The* TSP Polytope," and hence, *extended formulations* developments which pertain to that polytope and those for other hard combinatorial problems (such as Yannakakis (1991), or Fiorini *et al.* (2011; 2012; 2015), in particular), do not apply/cannot be applied to the developments in this paper. The reasons for this are fully detailed in Diaby and Karwan (2016a) and Diaby and Karwan (2016b), respectively, but will be briefly overviewed in this section. Pertaining to the Fiorini *et al.* (2011; 2012; 2015) developments in particular, as shown in Diaby and Karwan (2016a) and Diaby and Karwan (2016b), respectively, the existence of a linear transformation between the descriptive variables of two polytopes does not necessarily imply extension relations between the external descriptions of the polytopes from which valid/meaningful inferences can be made. This important subtlety was demonstrated in Diaby and Karwan (2016a and 2016b, respectively), and illustrated using polyopes consisting of single points (i.e., of dimension zero). In this section, we present a numerical example involving polytopes of dimensions greater than zero.

A.1. Alternate abstraction of the TSP Optimization Problem

Theorem 27 Consider the TSP defined on the set of cities $\Omega := \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. Assume city "0" has been designated as the starting and ending point of the travels. For the sake of greater clarity, let $M := \Omega \backslash \{0\}$ be the set of the remaining cities to be sequenced, and $S := \{1, \ldots, m\}$, the index set of the travel legs to cities "1" through "$n-1$" (where $m := n-1$). Then, there exists a one-to-one correspondence between TSP tours and extreme points of

$$AP := \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1)^2} : \sum_{t \in S} w_{i,t} = 1 \ \ \forall i \in M; \quad \sum_{i \in M} w_{i,t} = 1 \ \ \forall t \in S; \quad w \geq \mathbf{0} \right\}.$$

Proof. Using the assumption that city "0" is the starting and ending point of travel, it is trivial to construct a unique TSP tour from a given extreme point of AP, and vice versa (i.e., it is trivial to construct a unique extreme point of AP from a given TSP tour). ■

Example 28 We illustrate some of the differences between the city-stage Assignment-based modeling of this paper and the traditional (city-to-city) modeling which induces the standard TSP polytope (i.e., "*The* TSP polytope") using a 6-city problem with node set $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$.

- Assignment Problem representation of TSP tours:


S
1 2 3 4 5
M
1 2 3 4 5
• Assignment Solution:
(1,1), (2,2), (3,3), (4,4), (5,5)
• TSP tour to associate:
0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 0
S
1 2 3 4 5
M
1 2 3 4 5
• Assignment Solution:
(2,1), (3,2), (5,3), (1,4), (4,5)
• TSP tour to associate:
0 - 2 - 3 - 5 - 1- 4 - 0
In this representation:
• "TSP tours" per se are not induced by the constraints which are necessary to represent them. Hence, the polytope induced by those constraints is distinct and mathematically independent of "The TSP Polytope";
• Tour costs cannot be "captured" using a linear function in the standard descriptive variables of the Assignment Polytope (AP).

- Illustration of the Assignment Problem representation on the TSP Graph:


1
2
3
4
5
• Assignment Solution:
(1,1), (2,2), (3,3), (4,4), (5,5)
• TSP tour to associate:
0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 0
1
2
3
4
5
• Assignment Solution:
(2,1), (3,2), (5,3), (1,4), (4,5)
• TSP tour to associate:
0 - 2 - 3 - 5 - 1- 4 - 0
Notes:
• No cycles (i.e., "TSP tours" per se) are involved
• The existence of a node "0" cannot be mathematically derived from Assignment solutions.
• The correspondence to TSP tours is established through cognitive association only (and not through mathematical derivation).

- Illustration of the standard (city-to-city) representation on the TSP Graph:


0
1
2
3
4
5
Tour = 0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 0
0
1
2
3
4
5
Tour = 0 - 2 - 3 - 5 - 1- 4 - 0
Notes:
• Each cycle is a "TSP tour" per se;
• There exists no known "simple" way to model these cycles. Hence, the "TSP Polytope" per se is difficult to model through linear constraints;
• This "modeling difficulty" (what can/cannot be done with "The TSP Polytope") does not carry over to the AP-based representation.

Remark 29

1. It is not possible to make the city-to-stage Assignment representation induce TSP tours *per se* by adding a "dummy" city to the set of TSP cities and using it as the starting and ending point of the travels. The reason for this is that the cycle then obtained would not necessarily be a cycle in the actual TSP cities, as the begining and ending cities in that sequence may be different. Hence, the city-to-stage Assignment representation and the traditional (city-to-city) representation of TSP tours cannot be made to become equivalent using constraints expressed in the city-to-stage variables only. In other words, the equivalence (i.e., "making" the city-to-stage Assignment representation induce TSP tours *per se*) cannot be done mathematically while preserving the ("nice") AP structure.

2. As concerns the *extended formulations* "barriers" works (Yannakakis (1991); Fiorini *et al.* (2011; 2012; 2015)), it is important to observe that AP is also a TSP polytope, since a one-to-one correspondence can be established between its extreme points and TSP tours, and that its mathematical charateristics are unrelated to those of "*The* TSP Polytope."

   According to the *Minkowski-Weyl Theorem* (Minskowski (1910); Weyl (1935); see also Rockafellar (1997, pp.153-172)), every polytope can be equivalently described as the intersection of hyperplanes ($\mathcal{H}$-representation/external description) or as a convex combination of (a finite number of) vertices ($\mathcal{V}$-representation/internal description). "*The* TSP Polytope" is easy to state in terms of its $\mathcal{V}$-representation. However, no polynomial-sized $\mathcal{H}$-representation of it is known. On the other hand, the $\mathcal{H}$-representation of AP is well-known to be of (low-degree) polynomial size (see Burkard *et al.* (2009)), and it is trivial to state its $\mathcal{V}$-representation also.

   The vertices of AP are Assignment Problem solutions, whereas the vertices of "*The* TSP Polytope" are Hamiltonian cycles. Hence, even though the extreme points of AP and those of "*The* TSP Polytope" respectively correspond to TSP tours, the two sets of extreme points are different kinds of mathematical objects, with unrelated mathematical characterizations, and there does not exist any *a priori* mathematical relation between the two polytopes. In other words, AP and "*The* TSP Polytope" are simply alternate abstractions of TSP tours.

Or, put another way, AP is (simply) an alternate TSP polytope from "*The* TSP Polytope", and vice versa (i.e., that the "*The* TSP Polytope" is (simply) an alternate TSP polytope from AP).

3. As illustrated in Example 28 and also in the first point above, we do not attempt to induce TSP tours *per se* in this paper. Instead, we develop a higher-dimensional reformulation of city-to-stage Assignment representation, "building" enough information in the modeling variables themselves that the "judicious manipulation" of the costs called for in order to "complete" the abstraction from an overall optimization point-of-view is possible. Hence, we "side-step" (altogether) the issue of having to derive linear constraints that induce explicit TSP tours (which is at the crux of the difficulty in developing an $\mathcal{H}$-description of "*The* TSP polytope"). In other words, we do not deal with the issue of describing "*The* TSP polytope" in this paper. Rather we simply perform a reformulation of the city-to-stage Assignment representation discussed above in a higher-dimensional space. Clearly, since we are not modeling cycles/TSP tours *per se*, this approach can become a complete abstraction of the overall TSP optimization problem only if a proper/judicious objective function to apply to the reformulated-AP solutions can be developed. Note that the issue of a proper objective function to apply in "*The* TSP polytope" (traditional) modeling approach is a trivial one.

4. Somewhat more philosophically, the most fundamental subtlety to grasp may be the fact that there exists no *a priori* mathematical relationship (projective or otherwise) between our proposed AP-based model and "*The* TSP polytope." The associations which can be made between the two conceptualizations are *cognitive* only, and not "mathematical" *a priori*. This can be seen, for example, by considering the fact that one could not infer the existence of a (TSP) node "0" from the statement of our constraints only, as indicated in Example 28 above. From a general/common-sense perspective, if the addition of something changes conditions for what was added to, then whatever was added cannot have been "redundant," since that would be a contradiction of the definition of the term "redundant." In the context of this paper in particular, the *extended formulations* relationships that can be created through additions of redundant variables and constraints to our model can be degenerate ones only, from which it is not possible to make any meaningful inference (see Diaby and Karwan (2016a) and Diaby and Karwan (2016b), respectively, for formal developments of these). □

A.2. Non-applicability of the Fiorini *et al.* (2015) results

Extended formulations (EFs) have been the dominant theory which has been used in deciding on the validity of proposed LP models for hard combinatorial problems. All of the developments are predicated on the model being evaluated *projecting* to the "natural" polytope of the specific problem at hand. For the TSP that polytope is the one stated in terms of the natural, standard city-to-city variables, and is referred to in the literature as "*The* TSP Polytope."

We show in Diaby and Karwan (2016a) that the generalized version of the model proposed in this paper is not symmetric. Hence, among other reasons, the results in the seminal Yannakakis (1991)) work are not applicable to the model in this paper. Our developments in Diaby and Karwan (2016a and 2016b, respectively) specifically show the non-applicability of the Fiorini *et al.* (2011; 2012) developments to models which do not involve the variables of "*The* TSP Polytope" in general, and provide counter-examples using zero-dimensional polytopes (i.e., singletons) for convenience. In the latest version of their papers, Fiorini *et al.* (Fiorini *et al.* (2015)) stipulate that the polytopes

considered must have dimensions greater than zero. The objective of this section is to show that the counter-examples shown in Diaby and Karwan (2016a and 2016b, respectively) for the Fiorini *et al.* (2011; 2012) developments remain valid for the Fiorini *et al.* (2015) work. We do this by exhibiting polytopes of dimensions greater than zero which refute key foundation results in Fiorini *et al.* (2015). For convenience, we will start with a statement of the standard definition of an "*extended formulation*" as well as those of the alternate definitions used Fiorini *et al.* (2015). Then, we will discuss our numerical example. The discussions to follow apply to the developments in Braun *et al.* (2015) as well, since those developments are based on the same notions of *extended formulations*, "slack matrices", and "extension complexity", in particular.

Definition 30 ("Standard EF Definition") An *extended formulation* for a polytope $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ is a polyhedron $U = \{(x, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q} : Gx + Hw \leq g\}$ the projection, $\varphi_x(U) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : (\exists w \in \mathbb{R}^q : (x, w) \in U)\}$, of which onto x-space is equal to X (where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$, and $g \in \mathbb{R}^m$) (Yannakakis (1991)).

Definition 31 ("Fiorini *et al.* Definition #1") A polyhedron $U = \{(x, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q} : Gx + Hw \leq g\}$ is an *extended formulation* of a polytope $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ if there exists a linear map $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{p+q} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ such that X is the image of U under π (i.e., $X = \pi(U)$; where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$, and $g \in \mathbb{R}^m$) (see Fiorini *et al* (2015; p. 17:3, lines 20-21; p. 17:9, lines 22-23)).

Definition 32 ("Fiorini *et al.* Definition #2") An *extended formulation* of a polytope $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ is a linear system $U = \{(x, w) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q} : Gx + Hw \leq g\}$ such that $x \in X$ if and only if there exists $w \in \mathbb{R}^q$ such that $(x, w) \in U$. (In other words, U is an EF of X if $(x \in X \iff (\exists\ w \in \mathbb{R}^q : (x, w) \in U))$) (where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$, $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$, and $g \in \mathbb{R}^m$) (see Fiorini *et al.* (2015; p. 17:2, last paragraph; p. 17:9, line 20-21)).

Our numerical example will now be discussed.

Example 33 :Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}$ be disjoint vectors of variables. Let X be a polytope in the space of $\mathbf{x}$, and U, a polytope in the space of $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix}$, with:

$$X := Conv\left(\left\{\begin{pmatrix} 8 \\ 10 \\ 6 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 12 \\ 15 \\ 9 \end{pmatrix}\right\}\right), \text{ and} \tag{56}$$

$$U := \left\{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^4 : 2 \leq \mathbf{0} \cdot \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w} \leq 3\right\} \tag{57}$$

We now discuss some key results of Fiorini *et al.* (2015) which are refuted by X and U.

1. *Refutation of the validity of Definition 31.*

   (a) Note that the following is true for X and U:

$$\left(\mathbf{x} \in X \nLeftrightarrow \left(\exists \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R} : \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix} \in U\right)\right). \tag{58}$$

For example,

$$\left(\exists \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R} : \begin{pmatrix} w \\ 22.5 \\ -50 \\ 100 \end{pmatrix} \in U\right) \nRightarrow \left(\begin{pmatrix} 22.5 \\ -50 \\ 100 \end{pmatrix} \in X\right). \tag{59}$$

Hence, U **is not** an *extended formulation* of X according to Definition 32.

(b) Observe that the following is also true for X and U:

$$X = \left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \left(\mathbf{x} = A \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix} \in U\right)\right\}, \text{ where } A = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{60}$$

In other words, X is the image of U under the linear map A. Hence, U **is** an *extended formulation* of X according to Definition 31.

(c) It follows from (a) and (b) above, that Definitions 31 and 32 are in contradiction of each other with respect to X and U. Hence X and U are a refutation of the validity of Definition 31 (since it is easy to verify the equivalence of Definition 32 to Definition 30, which is the "standard" definition).

2. *Refutation of "Theorem 3" (p.17:10) of Fiorini et al. (2015).*

The proof of the theorem ("Theorem 3") hinges on Definition 32. The specific statement in Fiorini *et al.* (2015; p. 17:10, lines 26-28) is:

> "*...Because*
>
> $$Ax \leq b \iff \exists y : E^{=}x + F^{=}y = g^{=},\ E^{\leq}x + F^{\leq}y = g^{=}, \tag{61}$$
>
> *each inequality in* $Ax \leq b$ *is valid for all points of* Q*. ...*"

The equivalent of (61) in terms of X and U is:

$$\mathbf{x} \in X \iff \exists \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R} : \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix} \in U. \tag{62}$$

Clearly, (62) is **not true**, as we have illustrated in Part (1.*a*) above. Hence, the proof of "Theorem 3" (and therefore, "Theorem 3") of Fiorini *et al.* (2015) is refuted by X and U.

3. *Refutation of "Lemma 9" (p. 17:13-17:14) of Fiorini et al. (2015).*

The first part of the lemma is stated (in Fiorini *et al.* (2015)) thus:

> "*Lemma 9. Let* P, Q, *and* F *be polytopes. Then, the following hold:*
> *(i) if F is an extension of P, then* $\mathrm{xc(F)} \geq \mathrm{xc(P)}$;*...*"

The proof of this is stated as follows:

"*Proof. The first part is obvious because every extension of F is in particular an extension of P. ...*"

The notation "$xc(\cdot)$" stands for "*extension complexity* of $(\cdot)$," which is defined as (p. 17:9, lines 24-25 of Fiorini *et al.* (2015)):

"*...the extension complexity of P is the minimum size (i.e., the number of inequalities) of an EF of P.*"

The refutation of these for X (as shown in (56) above) and U (as shown in (57) above) is as follows.

As shown in Part (1) above, U is an *extension* of X according to Definition 31 (which is central in Fiorini *et al.* (2015)). This means that U is an *extended formulation* of every one of the infinitely-many possible $\mathcal{H}$-descriptions of X. This would be true in particular for the $\mathcal{H}$-description below for X:

$$X := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \\ \\ -5x_1 + 4x_2 \leq 0; \\ \\ 3x_2 - 5x_3 = 0; \\ \\ 3x_1 - 4x_3 \leq 0; \\ \\ 8 \leq x_1 \leq 12; \\ \\ 10 \leq x_2 \leq 15; \\ \\ 6 \leq x_3 \leq 9 \end{array} \right\}. \tag{63}$$

Clearly, however, we have that:

$$xc(U) \ngeq xc(X). \tag{64}$$

Hence, X and U are a refutation of "Lemma 9" of Fiorini *et al.* (2015), being that U is the *extension*, and X, the *projection,* according to definitions used in Fiorini *et al.* (2015).

□

According to Fiorini *et al.* (2015; p. 17:7, Section 1.4, first sentence; p. 17:11, lines 6-11; p. 17:14, lines 5-6; p.17:16, lines 13-14 after the "Fig. 4"), their "Theorem 3" and "Lemma 9" play pivotal, foundational roles in the rest of their developments. Hence, we believe we have offered a simple-yet-complete refutation of their developements when polytopes are described in terms of disjoint sets of variables, as is the case for the model in this paper in relation to "*The* TSP Polytope." Hence, no part of the Fiorini *et al.* (2015) developments is applicable to the model developed in this paper.

A.3. Meaning of the existence of a linear transformation

We will now provide some insights into the correct meaning/consequence of the existence of an affine map establishing a one-to-one correspondence between two polytopes that are stated in disjoint variable spaces, as brought to our attention in private e-mails by Yannakakis (2013). The linear map stipulated in Fiorini *et al.* (2012; 2015) in particular, is a special case of the affine map. In the case of polytopes stated in disjoint variable spaces, if the constraints expressing the affine transformation are *redundant* for each of the models/polytopes, the implication is that one model can be used in an "auxiliary" way, in order to solve the optimization problem over the other model, without any reference to/knowledge of the $\mathcal{H}$-description of that other model. This is shown in Remark 34 below.

Remark 34

- Let:
  - $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^q$ be disjoint vectors of variables;
  - $X := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p : Ax \leq a\}$;
  - $L := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q} : Bx + Cy = b\}$;
  - $Y := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^q : Dy \leq d\}$;

  (Where: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times p}$; $a \in \mathbb{R}^k$; $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$; $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$; $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$; $D \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times q}$, $d \in \mathbb{R}^l$).

- If $B^T B$ is nonsingular, then L can be re-written in the form:

  $$L = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+q} : x = \overline{C}y + \overline{b}\}.$$

  $$\text{(Where: } \overline{C} := -(B^T B)^{-1} B^T C, \text{ and } \overline{b} := (B^T B)^{-1} B^T b). \tag{65}$$

  Hence, the linear map stipulated in Definition 31 is simply a special case of L in which $b = 0$ and $B^T B$ is nonsingular.

- Assume that:
  - $L \neq \varnothing$ exists, with constraints that are *redundant* for X and Y, respectively;
  - the non-negativity requirements for x and y are included in the constraint sets of X and Y, respectively; and that:
  - $B^T B$ is nonsingular.

  (This is equivalent to assuming that the more general (affine map) version of the linear map stipulated in Definition 31 exists.)

- Then, the optimization problem:

  Problem LP_1:

| Minimize: $\alpha^T x$
|
| Subject To: $(x, y) \in L;\ \ y \in Y$
|
| (where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p$).

is equivalent to the smaller linear program:

Problem LP_2:

| Minimize: $\left(\alpha^T \overline{C}\right) y + \alpha^T \overline{b}$
|
| Subject To: $y \in Y$
|
| (where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p$).

- Hence, if L is the graph of a one-to-one correspondence between the points of X and the points of Y (see Beachy and Blair (2006, pp. 47-59)), then, the optimization of any linear function of x over X can be done by first using *Problem LP_2* in order to get an optimal y, and then using Graph L to "retrieve" the corresponding x. Note that the second term of the objective function of *Problem LP_2* can be ignored in the optimization process of *Problem LP_2*, since that term is a constant.

  Hence, if L is derived from knowledge of the $\mathcal{V}$-representation of X only, then this would mean that the $\mathcal{H}$-representation of X is not involved in the "two-step" solution process (of using *Problem LP_2* and then Graph L), but rather, that only the $\mathcal{V}$-representation of X is involved.

□

Hence, the existence of a linear map between points of the model in this paper and points of "*The* TSP Polytope" would simply imply that our model can be used in an "auxiliary" way, in order to solve the TSP optimization problem without any reference to/knowledge of the $\mathcal{H}$-description of "*The* TSP Polytope" since, as we have discussed above, our modeling is independent of the traditional variables of "*The* TSP Polytope" and the linear map could only be inferred from our knowledge of the $\mathcal{V}$-description of "*The* TSP Polytope." Hence, there does not exist any meaningful *extension* relationship between our constraint sets and an $\mathcal{H}$-description of "*The* TSP Polytope." Hence, the developments of Fiorini *et al.* (2012; 2015) in particular, which are predicated on the existence of such a linear map, are not applicable to the developments in this paper. Also, with respect to the developments in Fiorini *et al.* (2015) specifically, note that the Boolean Satisfiability Problem can be formulated, in a straightforward manner, as a linear program using the more generalized, generic version of the model in this paper developed in Diaby and Karwan (2016a).

Appendix B:
Software Implementation

- **General Description and Interface**

A software package, TSP LP Solver, has been submitted as supplementary files to this paper. TSP LP Solver builds linear programming (LP) models for the traveling salesman problem and calls CPLEX to solve them as LPs. The interface has been designed to run multiple replications of the chosen problem and run control settings at a time. With this tool, users can: (1) randomly generate or read a TSP cost matrix in multiple ways; (2) directly solve the TSP or only build the LP models; (3) adjust CPLEX settings for different tests; (4) show solutions (optimal objective, variables, routes) in different formats. The MTZ model is available for the purposes of verifying the correctness of the solutions obtained using our LP model. It is solved as an Integer Program, and only its objective function value is displayed. A screenshot of the TSP LP Solver is shown in Figure 16.



Figure 16: First Screen of the TSP LP Solver

- **Requirements**

TSP LP Solver is written in C# with .NET framework 4 and calls CPLEX 12.5 to solve models. For those with CPLEX 12.5, all functions in this program are available. For those with different

versions of CPLEX, problems may happen when calling CPLEX to solve. If so, users need to adjust references in the source code to rebuild the program. Users who do not wish to use CPLEX or to modify the source code can choose the Model Only button in order to build a .lp file (no requirement to use CPLEX) which they can then solve using the software of their choice.

- **Data**

There are two ways to input data to the solver: randomly generate and read cost data from files. For either way, users can check "Export all replications in XML format" to export cost files in XML format for every replication.

Randomly generating data supports the testing of multiple replications of a problem in a single run. Users input # of Cities (number of cities) and # of Replications. Cost values are generated based on either Euclidean distances or uniformly distributed random numbers. If the Euclidean distance option is chosen, the program will first randomly generate coordinates within a (0, 100) x (0, 100) square plane, and then randomly generate costs within the given percentage range of Euclidean distances. If (absolute) interval limits is chosen, the program will directly randomly generate costs within the given range, not based on Euclidean distances. Other options include whether the cost matrix is asymmetric or not (checked or unchecked), whether the cost matrix is integer or not (checked or unchecked), and whether the triangle inequality holds or is not required (checked or unchecked).

Reading cost files supports XML and CSV formats as input file formats. The required data format can be found in the attached Sample.xml and Sample.csv. The XML data format follows the classic TSPLIB.

- **Modelers and Solvers**

  - **Modeler Settings**
    If the Model Only button is chosen, the program will build an .lp file without the requirement to use CPLEX. If the Miller-Tucker-Zemlin (MTZ) model is chosen to be solved, the program will call CPLEX to build and solve the model and display the optimal objective value for reference. If the N5 LP model is chosen to be solved, the program will call CPLEX to build and solve the model and display the solution time, optimal objective value and other solution information depending on which are chosen among the show y solutions, show x solutions and show routes options.

  - **CPLEX Settings**
    If users have the correct CPLEX version on their machines, they can adjust CPLEX parameters with this tool and solve the model with different algorithmic settings. For details of each adjustable parameter, please refer to a CPLEX Parameters Reference from IBM.

- **Results**

  All output files are located in the "Results" subfolder of the folder containing the TSP LP Solver executable ("TSPsolvers.exe"), including the XML cost files, .lp files and solution text files.

The solution text file is named as "Tests on #-node random cases.txt" for randomly generated problems and "Tests on given cost files.txt" for tests with reading cost files. This file may include the MTZ objective value, along with the N5 LP model objective value, solution time, number of variables, number of constraints, values of the non-zero y variables, values of the non-zero x variables, and optimal routes.

The optimal routes are retrieved using our *iterative elimination* procedure. In the case that many alternate optimal TSP routes are involved in the solution (e.g. when a non-crossover interior-point method stops on a face due to alternate optima), the program will display all or a subset of these routes for reference. If it is desired that all of the alternate optimal routes in the solution be always displayed, users need to adjust the source code. We provide two versions of the iterative elimination in the source code: *SplitRoutesByY()* is a greedy-type implementation; *EnumerSplitByY()* involves an enumeration scheme for "tracing" the TSP paths through the y-variables with positive values in the solution. *EnumerSplitByY()* is more robust to avoid failure due to numerical issues, but is time-consuming. Besides these two methods, users can also apply perturbation means (Mangasarian, 1984) to make one the alternate optima the unique LP optimum, or a polynomial-time interior-point method which stops at a vertex optimum such as described in Wright (1997).

If any one of the following two cases is found, the program will create XML cost files for records for further analysis: (1) MTZ and N5 LP models result in different optimal objective values (this has never happened in our more than 1 million tests); (2) There are many optimal routes and the program only displays a subset of them.